# \*\*\*\*\*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*\*PRE-DECISIONAL DOCUMENT\*\*\*\*\*

#### SITE REEVALUATION WORKSHEET

SFUND RECORDS CTR 2376744

Site Name:

Staefa Control Systems

EPA ID No.:

CAD 982 400 228

TDD No.: City:

F9-8905-016 San Leandro

County:

Alameda

Site Evaluator:

Yoon K. Toh, ICF Technology, Incorporated

Date:

September 11, 1989

#### POTENTIAL RELEASES

[ X ]	Ground Water
[ ]	Surface Water
[ ]	Air
[ ]	On-site/Direct Contac

SCORING SCENARIOS	Best Case	Worst Case
GROUND-WATER ROUTE SCORE (Sgw) =	0.61	3.30
SURFACE WATER ROUTE SCORE (Sw) =	1.13	7.43
AIR ROUTE SCORE (Sa) =	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (Sm) =	0.74	2.37

# PROPOSED REVISED HRS MODEL CONSIDERATIONS

GROUND-WATER ROUTE: An increase in migration route from three to four miles will not significantly change the target population.

SURFACE WATER ROUTE: The site is located about 1.75 miles from the San Francisco Bay where recreation, fishing, spawning, and wildlife habitat may be found. As a result, a significant increase in HRS scoring via this route might occur.

AIR ROUTE: There is no information indicating a potential for release via this route.

ON-SITE ROUTE: Since the site is paved and the contaminants were found in the subsurface soil; therefore, risks of on-site exposure is low.

# \*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*\*PRE-DECISIONAL DOCUMENT\*\*

### GROUND-WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET

	Best Case	Worst Case	Ref.	Conf.
1. OBSERVED RELEASE		45.	1	2:
2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS				
DEPTH TO AQUIFER OF CONCERN (×2)	4	· · ·		
NET PRECIPITATION	2			
PERMEABILITY OF UNSATURATED ZONE	0			
PHYSICAL STATE	3		<u> </u>	
ROUTE CHARACT. SCORE =	<u> </u>			
3. CONTAINMENT	1			· ·
4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS:				
TOXICITY/PERSISTENCE	12	12		K
HAZARDOUS WASTE QUANTITY	1	2	2	
WASTE CHARACT. SCORE =	13	14		2
5. TARGETS:	,			
GROUND-WATER USE (×3)	3	3		<u>K</u>
DISTANCE TO NEAREST WELL/ POPULATION SERVED	0	0		<u>K</u>
TOTAL TARGETS SCORE =	3	3	,	<u>K</u>
GROUND-WATER ROUTE SCORE =	0.61	3.30		3

# \*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*\*PREDECISIONAL DOCUMENTS\*\*

### SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET

	•	-		· regard
	Best Case	Worst Case	Ref.	Conf.
1. OBSERVED RELEASE		0	1	
2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS				W. Property of the Control of the Co
2. NOOTE CHARACTERISTICS				
FACILITY SLOPE AND INTERVENING TERRAIN	0	0		, ,
1-YR., 24-HR. RAINFALL	2	2		
DISTANCE TO NEAREST SURFACE WATER (×2)	2	2		<u></u>
PHYSICAL STATE	3	3		·
ROUTE CHARACT. SCORE =		7		<u> </u>
	•			
3. CONTAINMENT	1	2	3	
4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS:				
TOXICITY/PERSISTENCE	18	18		<u>K</u>
HAZARDOUS WASTE QUANTITY	1	2	2	1
WASTE CHARACT. SCORE =	19	20		<u>K</u>
5. TARGETS:				
SURFACE WATER USE (×3)	6	6		<u>K</u>
DISTANCE TO A SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT (×2)	2	2		K
POPULATION SERVED/ DISTANCE TO DOWNSTREAM WATER INTAKE	0	0		<u>K</u>
TOTAL TARGETS SCORE =	8	8	. <del></del> -	K
SURFACE WATER ROUTE SCORE =	1.65	3.48		_3

# 

### AIR ROUTE WORKSHEET

	Best Case	Worst Case	Ref.	Conf.
1. OBSERVED RELEASE	0	0		<u>K</u>
DATE AND LOCATION:				
2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS:				
REACTIVITY AND INCOMPATIBILITY				
TOXICITY (×3)		7 741.14		
HAZARDOUS WASTE QUANTITY				
WASTE CHARACT. SCORE =		·		
3. TARGETS:	·			
POPULATION WITHIN 4 MILES				
DISTANCE TO SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT (×2)		,		
LAND USE				
TOTAL TARGETS SCORE =				
AIR ROUTE SCORE =	0	0	•	TZ.

### RATIONALE

- 1. Assume that a documented release has occurred via this route.
- 2. The quantity of hazardous wastes used on-site is not known.
- 3. No information is available on the containment of hazardous substances used onsite.